

U.S. Appl. No. 09/695,152  
Reply to Office Action dated October 5, 2005

PATENT  
450100-02779

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present remarks are being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

#### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1 and 5 are independent.

#### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,745 to Miichi, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Miichi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,644 to Urade, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Urade").

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Miichi in view of Urade and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,181 to Nguyen, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Nguyen").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"input/output means connected to the control device and adapted for generating display control signals controlling said display means, said input/output means being further connectable to at least one external peripheral equipment to input/output data pertaining to **supplementary identification information appended to input data**; and

wherein said display control means controls a picture projected by said display means based on said display control signal generated and output from said control device corresponding to **said supplementary identification information appended to input data** input through said input/output means **to identify said projection apparatus**."(emphasis added)

U.S. Appl. No. 09/695,152  
Reply to Office Action dated October 5, 2005

PATENT  
450100-02779

As understood by Applicant, Miichi relates to a liquid crystal projection apparatus where visual control of an image can be directly carried out. A remote control signal transmitted from a remote controller is converted to a mouse signal or a keyboard signal corresponding to a personal computer connected with a main body.

As understood by Applicant, Urade relates to a USB hub controlled by a microcontroller that sends a suspend request to the microcontroller from the USB hub; sends a stop clock request from the microcontroller to the USB hub in response to the suspend request and stops the USB hub controller clock in response to the suspend request.

It is respectfully submitted that Miichi and Urade, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-recited features of independent claim 1. Specifically, independent claim 1 recites, **said supplementary identification information appended to input data** input through said input/output means **to identify said projection apparatus**. The Office Action states that Miichi distinguishes the type of personal computer connected to the main body on the basis of the inputted horizontal (H) and vertical (V) synchronizing signals. After the personal computer is identified, the MPU has to find out the type of mouse that the computer can use depending on its type. The ports IOA0-IOA8 of the MPU are outputted signals for selecting or identifying the mouse signal data corresponding to the personal computer from among the mouse signal data corresponding to the various types of personal computers stored in ROM.

Applicant respectfully submits that distinguishing the type of personal computer does not anticipate identifying the projection apparatus.

Applicant submits that Nguyen fails to provide any disclosure that would remedy the deficiencies of Miichi and Urade.

U.S. Appl. No. 09/695,152  
Reply to Office Action dated October 5, 2005

PATENT  
450100-02779

Therefore, independent claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 5 is also believed to be patentable.

### III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are dependent from one of the amended independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.


U.S. Appl. No. 09/695,152  
Reply to Office Action dated October 5, 2005

PATENT  
450100-02779

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800